

Bāzyāft

ISSN1992-3678



Editor

Prof Dr Zahid Munir Amir



پنجاب یونیورسٹی اور بین الاقوامی
شعبہ اسلامیات

Exploring the Invariant Core: An Analysis of Multiple Translations of a Selection from Iqbal's *Shikwah*

Nasir Mehmood

Hazrat Umar

ABSTRACT:

This paper is an attempt to explore the invariant core among the three English translations of selected poetry from Iqbal's *Shikwah*. The study identifies that the complex nature of poetry makes it difficult for the translators to transfer the ST in terms of both content and form. Therefore, good poetry is translated not only once, but several times by different translators with their different approaches and strategies. Accordingly, Iqbal's *Shikwah* and *Jawab -e- Shikwah* is translated by three translators, including two foreign and one indigenous translator. This is a qualitative research, and Viney and Darbelnet's model of translational analysis was used as it best suited the qualitative nature of the present research. The study was delimited to the three selected translations of a stanza from Iqbal's famous poem *Shikwa* rendered by the three translators Arbury, Singh, and Akhtar. The analysis of the translations has shown that in rendering the original text, the translators have used different procedures and strategies which consequently resulted in various losses, specifically in terms of form, however, the invariant core, which comprises both theme and tone, remains almost the same.

Keywords:

Translation, poetry, invariant core, Iqbal, *Shikwa*, source text

Introduction

Poetry is a creative art and the poem reflects the innermost feelings of its author. However, no poetry is either purely subjective or objective as its subject matter consists of what the poet feels about the objects and events around him. It is quite natural that the poet's own feelings and the impressions which they take from the external environment as well as society must be expressed in the language of poetry. In simple words, both psycho and social

elements constitute poetry. When it comes to the translation of poetry, it is not a simple task to do as it requires a very creative faculty and skills to reproduce the poem in another language. In comparison with the poet, it poses a double challenge for the translator to first understand a poem in the source language (SL), and then render it in the target language (TL) in a befitting manner.

As the present world has shortened into a global village, communication has also become quicker. People around the world feel the need to contact each other through language. However, due to rapid increase in multilingualism, there are around seven thousand languages used in different parts of the world as the recent studies have shown (Deumert, 2011). Because it is not possible for a speaker to communicate in every language, therefore, translation provides the only feasible solution, enabling the people of different language communities to develop a mutual understanding with one another in terms of language. But one tricky area with respect to translation is that languages are not similar because they organize experiences in different ways. As Sapir and Whorf (1958) argue that “no two languages are ever sufficiently similar to be considered as representing the same social reality (as cited in Bassnet, 2002, p. 21). Therefore, the question arises: do languages vary beyond the limit? The answer to this question is simply no, because if it were so, then translation from one language to another language would not have been possible. Human beings would not have been able to communicate as well as understand one another. In fact, it is the act of translation which makes the task of communicating and understanding quite easy. It is a translation which brings together people with their different linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Translators deal with a variety of subjects and literatures making them accessible to the readers of the target language in their linguistic and cultural system. Most importantly, of all genres of literature, poetry is perhaps the hardest to translate. As Bassnet (2002, p. 83) argues that out of all literary translations, more time has been devoted to exploring the problems of rendering poetry as compared to other literary mode. She states further that these problems include both the evaluations of a single work as well as

personal statements by individual translators in terms of how they have handled the issues during translating the poetry. As Popvic(1975) argues that a single text is translated by more than one translators which will produce different versions of the original, but there will be a basic, stable and constant semantic element, shared by all those versions which is, what he called the “invariant core” of meaning. The present work is precisely in the same line as it is an attempt to figure out the strategies used by translators in rendering *Shikwah*. Moreover, it tries to explore how far these strategies affect the core meaning of the original and to what extent the invariant core of meaning is common among all the translations.

Pakistani literature is rich with a range of material which reflects our social, religious, political and cultural values. Most importantly, the poetry of Iqbal shows a true picture of our society in terms of religion, politics and culture. He was a great source of motivation, not only for the native translators, but also for many foreign translators who rendered his Persian as well as Urdu Poetry. Where Milton wrote “Paradise Lost” to justify the “ways of God to men”, Iqbal wrote *Shikwah* and *Jawab-e-Shikwah* in order to do the same, but this time within the context of the woes of Muslims and their complaints. *Shikwa* (1909) exalts the legacy of Islam and its civilizing role in history, but it laments the fate of Muslims in the modern times. *Shikwa* arises from the anguish of the poet’s heart in the form of a complaint to Allah for having let down the Muslims and *Jawab-e-Shikwah* is Allah's reply to the forceful voice of the poet. When the first part of these poems, i.e. *Shikwah* (1909) was published, it created a big uncertainty amongst Muslim scholars who perhaps thought that the poet is being impolite, inconsiderate in his words when talking to God in his book and being unthankful to God for His blessings, since the second part of his poem *Jawab-e-Shikwa* was not announced with their publication of the first one. But later when *Jawab-e-Shikwa* (1913) was published, everyone admired him for his useful contribution to Urdu Poetry and making a difference in Islamic literature. The focal point of the present work is the comparative study of three English translations of the subject poems which were composed four years after Iqbal’s return from Europe. About the poems Arbury (1987, p. iii) argues

that “they mark the beginning of that remarkable career as philosopher and poet which brought Iqbal ever-increasing renown, until long before his death in 1938.....”.

Another significant factor which is related to the present study is the linguistic and cultural distance between the source text and the target texts. Venuti (2001, p. 130) describes three different situations: Firstly, when the languages and cultures comparatively (highly/equal /near) are related. Secondly, when languages are not related, but the cultures are closely parallel. Thirdly, the situation when both languages and cultures are highly distant. In the present case, the above three situations exist as the three English translations of the same Urdu poems have been carried out by different translators. Arbury is a British translator whose mother tongue is English and so is his culture. The second translation is rendered by Khushwanth Singh, who is from India. His translation, unlike Arbury is also accompanied by a Hindi translation (being his mother tongue) along with original Urdu text. In this case, languages are different, but cultures have many similarities. The third translation is done by Akhtar, who is an indigenous translator from the same language and culture.

The suggested study is valuable as it is an attempt to identify whether these translations bear the essence of the source text. The work is also noteworthy as it focuses on looking at translations in terms of how far they transfer the content of the source text which is rich with cultural, political and religious elements. These terms are linked to an ideology which is the most popular term with respect to the ongoing research in translation studies.

Statement of the Problem

The language of poetry is quite removed from a common language in use. Lexemes and phrasemes in a poem have not only individual meanings, but they also contribute to the overall meaning of the poem. The lexical and syntactical choices made by the translators have both denotational and connotational meanings which subsequently result in translational gains and losses. The

present study takes into account linguistic strategies, the translators' syntactic and lexical preferences used in the three selected translations of the three translators belonging to three different nations, religions and with their different logics behind translating these poems. Further, this research also explores as to how these choices affect the meaning in the act of translations. Also, significant is to understand the message and the point of view of the author, which is not always explicit in the poems. The present study, by juxtaposing the ST with TTs as well as comparing and contrasting them in terms of the form and content, has investigated as to how far the TTs reflect the point of view of the poet and preserve the message of the ST.

Research Questions

1. In what ways do the strategies used by the translators in the three selected English translations of *Shikwa and Jawab-e-Shikwa* impact the translation?
2. How far do the selected translations of the stanza share the invariant core of the source text?

Theoretical Framework

Translation is governed by certain norms, principles, theories, strategies and methodologies for different types of texts create the background for facilitating translational analysis, review and criticism, notes New mark (1988). Accordingly, the present research has focused on the analysis of three English translations of the selected poetry from Iqbal's Urdu poem *Shikwah* for which Vinay and Darbelnet (2004) model has been used. The model describes two major translation strategies: direct translation and oblique translation. The first covers three more procedures, including borrowing, calque and literal translation. Borrowing is a technique in which the translator makes a deliberate choice to use the same word in the target text as it is found in the source text (Vinay & Darbelnet, 2004, p. 85). Calque is a special type of borrowing in which a word or a phrase is literally translated root-for-root or word-for-word from one language into another language. Literal translation means word for word translation, which, according to Vinay and Darbelnet (pp. 86-87), is most

common between languages of the same family and culture. He argues that literal translation is the author's prescription for a good translation, but in case where literal translation is not possible, notes oblique translation should be used. Oblique translation comprises transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. Transposition means to change one part of speech, such as verb into a noun, adverb into a verb or changing the singular into plural without changing the sense. Modulation is a variation or change of point of view, of perspective or very often of category of thought. For example, 'it is not difficult to show' can be expressed as 'it is easy to show'. Equivalence refers to a strategy when two languages describe the same situation by different stylistic or structural means. Equivalence is particularly useful in the translation of idioms and proverbs where the sense if not the image can be conveyed. Adaptation involves changing the cultural reference when a situation which exists in the source culture, but does not exist in the target culture. Keeping in view the nature of this research work, this model provides a rich ground for the analysis of three selected English translations of Iqbal's Urdu poem *Shikwah*. Keeping in view the three English renderings of the same Urdu poem by different translators, the model provides useful tools for the analysis of these translations.

Research Methodology

This research has used qualitative approach as its epistemological orientation is based on interpretation. The textual analysis is based on the original poems as well as the renderings by the translators. We have made a comparative stylistic analysis (translation analysis) of the texts (ST and TTs) in the light of Vinay and Darbelnet (2000) model. The model describes two main translation strategies: direct translation and oblique translation. The former covers three further procedures, including borrowing, calque and literal translation. The latter includes transposition, modulation, equivalence and adaptation. The model is useful for the present study as it provides the necessary tools for the analysis. The three translations will be juxtaposed with original text in order to see which translational strategies have been used in the three English translations of the Urdu poems *Shikwah* and *Jawab e*

Shikwah. Moreover, the study also takes into account the role of the translators, their own thinking, knowledge, ideologies and the positions they take about their own language and the language and culture from which they are translating, as outlined in Penrod (1993). For this purpose, the introductions and prefaces of the selected translators have been considered before looking into the actual translations.

Iqbal's both Persian and Urdu works have been translated by several indigenous as well as foreign translators. They include, Nicholson, Victor Kiernan, Annemarie Schimmel, Frances Pritchett, A. R. Tariq, Syed Akbar Ali Shah, M. Yaqoob Mirza, M. Hadi Hussain, Ikram Azam, Sultan Zahoor Akhtar, A.J. Arbury Khushwanth Singh. However, the present research work was delimited to the analysis of the three translations of a single stanza from *Shikwa*. The two poems *Shikwah* and *Jawab-e-Shikwah* have been rendered by the two foreign translators, i.e. Khushwanth Singh in 1981, by Arbury in 1987. Later on, it was translated by Sultan Zahoor Akhtar—a Pakistani translator in 1998. The prime focus of the present study remains on what translational strategies have been used in the three English translations. Moreover, the study also explores as to how these strategies influence the translations as a finished product.

Literature Review

The debate over whether the translation should be source text oriented or target text oriented has continued from Cicero to the 21st century. Therefore, a historical investigation of the way in which the object of study has been conceptualized and discussed is always significant. As Gorp (1978) points out that the concept of translation is far from being universal and even if similarities exist, the boundaries between related concepts such as adaptation and rewriting are not necessarily clear or uniformly drawn, either historically or at a given moment of time, not even within the same linguistic tradition. According to Venuti (1995) translation scholars and theorists are divided in their stand point concerning the two popular pair of words. He holds that translators in general have a propensity to translate 'fluently' into English to produce an

idiomatic and readable target text and to create the false impression of transparency. He further points out that a literary text, when translated, is considered to be acceptable by the publishers, reviewers and readers when it is transparent and when the absence of linguistic and stylistic features makes it appear fluent. On the surface level, it gives the meaning of the foreign text in a way which shows that the translation is not a translation, but the original (Venuti, 1995). Alternatively, a translation project may obey the rules and values which are currently dominating the target language culture, taking a conventional approach to the foreign text, adapting it to support domestic canons (Baker, 1998). According to Venuti(1995), domesticating strategy has been used since ancient Rome, when Latin poets like Horace and Propertius translated Greek texts into Roman. He argues that domestication involves an adherence to domestic literary canons, not only in choosing a foreign text, but also in developing a translation method. Sir John Denham translated Book 2 of the *Aenied* in heroic couplets emphasizing that "if Virgil must need speak English, it were fit he should speak not only as a man of this nation, but as a man of this age", notes Steiner (1775). Translation studies have recently become a fast-growing discipline and one of the interesting areas of research. It is no more restricted purely to language bound simple theories. In the closing years of the 20th century, translation theorists and scholars began to look at translation studies from a new angle. Thus the move from translation as text towards translation as culture was, in fact, in the words of Snell-Hornby (1990), 'the cultural turn' which gave a new course to the research in the field. Cultural studies have taken an increasingly keen interest in translation as a result of which it brought together scholars from a broad range of backgrounds.

Translation is basically associated with transfer of messages from one language into another; the standard of translation for the most part depends upon how effectively the original message is communicated. Analysis of translation entails comparing it with the original text in terms of relationship. This relationship has been generally defined as the degree of equivalence. The subject of equivalence with respect to typologies, and theoretical concept has

provided a fertile ground for further research as translation theorists have interpreted the concept of equivalence in different ways. Catford states that “the central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. A central task of translation theory is that of defining the nature and conditions of translation equivalence” (1965, p. 21). Although, Catford’s model explains equivalence only at sentence level, yet his approach towards the nature of equivalence has found favour in machine translations (Baker, 2001, p. 76). Vinay and Darbelnet, while studying the stylistic differences between English and French pointed out that equivalence in translation is a procedure which ‘replicates the same situation’ of the original by using different words, notes Munday (2001, p. 58). They claimed that dictionaries are useful for the translator in finding semantic equivalence of SL word, but the translator further needs to look into the SL situation and then use the comparable term in translation. Roman Jakobson (1959) based his work on the Sassuruian concept of *signifier* and *signified*, handled the issue of equivalence in translation (2001). Both signifier and signified combine to make a “linguistic sign” which is “arbitrary” (2001, p. 36). The application of linguistic sign was extended to translation. Jacobson divided translation into three types, i.e. intralingual translation, interlingual translation and inter semiotic translation. The first type is associated with the substitution of verbal signs with other signs within the language. The second type is an interpretation of oral symbols in some other language. The last type, also known as transmutation, has to do with alternation of oral symbol with non-oral symbol (ibid). The proposed research work is intended to deal with the second type as it aimed to study the relationship between the messages in two different languages. According to Jakobson (1959) translation involves two equivalent messages in two different codes, but he states that the contents of the message may include nuances and relations which are not transferred from one language to another; and therefore, ‘there is no full equivalence between code-units. He argued that “equivalence is the cardinal problem of language and pivotal concern of linguistics” (as cited in Munday, 2001, p. 37). Both these theories highlight the limits of linguistic theory, but they also highlight the role of the translator as a decision maker who has

several options to choose from in the process of translation. However, the choices made by translator should not go beyond the social conventions and norms of translation. As Chesterman (1997) argues, a translator must have a theory of translation or translate blindly.

Therefore, translation is primarily concerned with the transfer of meaning from one set of language signs into another set of language signs. However, language is not used in isolation; it is a medium of expression as well as a guide to social reality. Words are the primary units of text. They bear not only individual meanings, but also the contextual meaning. This polyphonic nature of a word shows the importance of translation. Equally important is the role of a translator who has to understand the communicative and pragmatic connotations behind a word. As an absolute equivalence between the original and translation is not possible, the degree of closeness depends upon the understanding and interpretation. According to Lefevere (1998) the translator proper is content to render the original's interpretation of a theme accessible to a different audience. The writer of versions basically keeps the substance of the source text, but changes its form. Hermeneutics is the art of understanding which does not rely on simple translation of text, but it seeks to understand others in the language of their own. It enables the translator to grasp the meaning in linguistic and historical horizon which does not remain the same in which the original text was produced by the author. In this way the process of translation involves both linguistic as well an extra-linguistic criteria (Bassnet, 2001, p. 21). In this context, at the textual level, the proposed study will focus on the translation strategies used by the translators in rendering these poems. Moreover, at extra-textual level, the role of the translators, their own thinking, stances and ideologies about their own language and the language and culture from which they are translating, will also be considered.

English Writers around the world have translated famous Urdu literature. Accordingly, by acknowledging his genius as well as the worth of his poetry, Iqbal's poems have been translated by the galaxy of translators in the twentieth century, notes Nath (1991). Several studies have been done by Pakistani researchers regarding

the analysis of these translations from different angles. Ayaz (2009) made a research work on the exercise of manipulation in Kiernan's English translation of a few selected poems from Iqbal's poetry. Her study was concerned with critical discourse analysis of the power structure involved in translating a foreign text. Later on, Asghar(2013) carried out research on the domestication in English translation of Iqbal's poetry, rendered by Kiernan. His work too has made a significant contribution to the existing knowledge in the field. One common feature in both these studies was that their scope was limited to the analysis of a single translation which left the scope for further research. As for the research work with respect to the analysis of the comparative analysis and worth of multiple translations of a single text, little work has been done so far. It is in this context, the current study aims to explore the translational strategies, applied in three different translations of Iqbal's Urdu poems *Shikwah* and *Jawab e Shikwah* rendered by two foreign and one indigenous translators. Moreover, it focuses on how far these strategies influence the process/product of translation.

Analysis of Data

The textual data for this study comprise the three translations of a stanza from *Shikwah* rendered by Singh, Arbury, and Akhtar.

Kiounziyankarbanunsudfaramoshrahun

Fikr-I farad nakarunmahw-i- gham-idoshrahun

Nale bulbul kesununawrhamatan gosh rahun

Hamnawamaenbhi koi gulhunkehkhameshrahun

Juratamozmeri tab-I sukhanhaimujhko

Shikwah Allah se khakambadhanhaimujhko

Arbury's Translation

Why must I forever suffer loss, oblivious to gain,

Why think not upon the morrow, drowned in grief for yesterday?

Why I must I attentive heed the nightingale's lament to pain?

Fellow- bard, am I arose, condemned to silence all the way?

No; the burning power of song bids me be bold and not to faint.

Dust be in my mouth, but God—He is the theme of my complaint.

Khushwanth Singh's Translation

Why must I forever lose, forever forgo profit that is my due,

Sunk in the gloom of evenings past, no plans for the morrow pursue.

Why must I all attentive to the nightingale's lament,

Friend, am I as dumb as a flower? Must I remain silent?

My theme makes me bold, makes my tongue more eloquent.

Dust fills my mouth, against Allah I make complaint.

Raja Sultan Zahoor Akhtar's Translation

Why should I suffer loss,

And abstain to quest what avail I may?

Nor image of what tomorrow retains,

And despond over sorrow of yesterday?

Why I should my ears entrenched hear,

The doleful cries of the nightingale?

O fellow - bard! A posy am I,

To lose me in sweet music's dilate?
For I too have the gift of note,
Which gives me mettle to complain.
But alas! It is Creator Himself.
To whom in gloom I must explain!

Analysis

It appears that the three translations are different from one another in terms of length, shape, style and organization of lines. Both Arbury and Khushwanth Singh closely follow the original Urdu poem restricting their translations to six line stanza as they have employed a proper meter and rhyme scheme in their translations. They translate the initial line in somewhat similar way by preserving question style of the original with the word "why". However, both are different in terms of how they string words together in order to make larger constructions. Arbury translates the first half line *kion zian karbannun* as "Why must I suffer loss". The same line is translated by Khushwanth Singh as "why must I forever lose". Both of the translators transfer the adjective *ziānkār* in the source text as a verb in their translations, a strategy which Viney and Darbelnet refer to as transposition in their model. Arbury has transposed it as "suffer loss" which is a verb phrase and Khushwanth Singh transposed it as "lose" which is a verb. The remaining half line *sud faramosh rahun* has been translated by Arbury as "oblivious to gain" in which the adjective "oblivious", stands as the closest equivalent to the word *sud faramosh* which is also an adjective. However, in Khushwanth Singh's translation, the same half line has been translated as "forever forgo profit that is my due". It appears that Khushwanth Singh, while continuing with the same strategy of transposition, translates the adjective Urdu word *sud faramosh* into the English verb phrase "forgo profit". He maintains the same "f" sound throughout the line by using the words forever, forever and forgo to create musical resonance, a technique known as alliteration, but unlike Arbury, he lengthens the translation as the word 'forever'

has been repeated, possibly for the sake of emphasis. Sultan Zahoor Akhtar's translation is quite different from the other two translations in terms of structure and form as there seems to be no meter and rhyme scheme. However, his translation has some resemblance to that of Arbury's translation in terms of the content as he translates the initial first half of the line as "Why I should suffer loss" but he actually **transposes** both adjectives *ziankar* and *sud faramosh* as verb phrases i.e. "suffer loss" and "abstain to quest". The analysis shows that the translators have employed different strategies in their renditions, but on the whole we can infer the more or less the same message from them. In other words, on the surface level they seem to differ from one another, but the invariant core remains the same to a significant extent,

The second line is also rendered differently by the three translators. Arbury, by following almost the same structure of the original, translates first half of the second line as "Why think not upon the morrow". Singh on the other hand makes syntactical readjustment and moves the first half of the Urdu poem into the second half in the English translation as he renders the same as "no plans for the morrow pursue". Similarly, he translates the second half i.e. *mahw-i-gham-idosh rahun* as "Sunk in the gloom of evenings past" and moves it to the first half in his English translation. One possible reason for this syntactical readjustment may be that he is more concerned with making the word "pursue" rhyme with the word "due" in the first line. In Raja Sultan's translation, the structure of the original lines remains the same, but the translation shows only the occasional rhyme as it is only in the first stanza where, by changing the usual structure, the modal verb "may" has been moved to the end of the line in the alternate line. The clause which could have been, 'what I may avail', reads as 'what avail I may'. It looks that the translators have opted for different choices available to them, which makes their translations apparently different, but the invariant core of the three forms remains the same.

As for the third line, Arbury's translation shows the continuation of the same tone as the word "why" has been repeated three times which creates a smooth flow in the translation. The

same is the case with Khushwanth Singh's translation as he, like Arbury, translates the words *Nale bulbul kesununas* "why must all attentive be to the nightingale's lament" with the addition of the word "all". But where Khushwanth Singh's translation ends with the word "lament" which makes this word rhyme with the last word "silent" in the next line, Arbury makes a further addition by putting the word "pain" after the word "lament". The apparent reason for this is that the word "pain" is a homophone of the word "gain" in the initial line. Akhtar's translation of the same line is literal, which looks very different from the other two translators as he translates it as "Why should my ears entrenched here, the doleful cries of the nightingale?" In the next line, the word *hamnawa* is translated by Arbury and Akhtar in the same way as they use the word "Fellow bard". Similarly, they respectively use the words "rose" and "posy", which are used synonymously. However, the remaining half of the line is translated by the former as "condemned to silence all the way" and by the latter as "To loose me in sweet music's dilate?" which looks quite different. Khushwanth Singh translates the same line in simple words and almost in a literal sense as "Friend, am I as dumb as a flower? Must I remain silent? The use of simile i.e. "as dumb as a flower" seems to be very uncommon in general use, but by choosing the words "Friend" in the beginning of the line, and "flower" in the simile, the translator seems to use alliteration as a euphonic device in order to create a musical and melodic effect. This becomes clearer when he continues with the "m" sound in the final couplet of the stanza:-

My theme makes me bold, makes my tongue more eloquent.

Dust fills my mouth, against Allah I make complaint.

This again creates a pleasant euphony in these lines. Finally, these differences to some extent affect the form, but the content more or less remains invariant.

The final couplet of the ST is translated by the other two translators with different lexical choices. Arbury translates the line as "the burning power of song bids me be bold and not to faint", "Dust be in my mouth, but God—He is the theme of my

complaint. Khushwanth Singh's translation has some resemblance with Arbury's translation in terms of word choice. However, there is syntactical shuffling as the word "theme" has been brought in front of the line: "My theme makes me bold". Moreover, the word "Allah" has been transferred by Khushwanth Singh without any change, whereas Arbury has used the word "God". As for the translation of the word *Khakambadhan*, both Arbury and Khushwanth Singh have respectively made literal translations i.e. 'Dust be in my mouth', and 'Dust fills my mouth'. Moreover, they have applied alliterations by repeatedly using words with 'm' sound. Arbury's translation also shows the use of words with 'b' sound which make it more melodious as compared to Singh's translation. As for Akhtar's translation, it seems that it is the meaning rather than the sound which happens to be the primary concern. In translating the same couplet, he not only uses different lexemes, but he also makes syntactical changes. The word *tabesukhan* which occurs in the second half of the line in the original, has been translated as the 'gift of note' which looks like a more natural English expression. Moreover, he also makes use of *enjambment* as he extends the translation to the next line which is read as 'Which gives me mettle to complain'. The word 'which' has been used as a conjunction which creates cohesion in the two lines. Similarly, he almost recreates the next line as unlike the other two translators who either directly transfers or translates the word 'Allah', he uses the expression 'it is Creator Himself' where the reflexive pronoun 'Himself', seems to be used for the sake of putting extra emphasis. Furthermore, the same sense continues to flow as the reflexive pronoun is linked to the next line: 'To whom in gloom I must explain! This translation seems to convey better sense and meaning of the original when compared to the literal translation of the other two translations. As far the poetic devices, he has used alliteration in some words like 'me' and 'mettle' and gives" and 'gloom'. However, his translation lacks a regular pattern of rhyme, but the word 'complain' in the first line rhymes with the word 'explain' in the fourth line. In short, there are some differences in the surface structures of the three translations, but the overall message of the poet is conveyed when compared with the original.

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study has revealed that rendering of poetry needs a lot of techniques and skills on the part of translators, especially in those cases where the languages such as English and Urdu are different with respect to vocabulary and syntax. Moreover, for a translation, in order to be successful, it should contain both form and content of the original, which is itself not an easy task to do. The former refers to the way the poem is structured. It refers to the pattern of rhyme, rhythm and the words used by the poet. As the analysis has shown, most of the words in the Urdu stanza were compound words with the complex meaning association. Apart from the meaning, they were strung together in a specific manner where they appeared to have created a balance in the individual lines as well as in the stanza as a whole. For example, words like *ziyankarand sudfaramosh; Fikr-i-faradaand mahw-i-ghamidosh; Nale bulbuland hamatangosh; gulandkhamosh* show a relationship in terms of both comparison and contrast where the meaning and sound are interconnected in an intricate manner. Such poetry makes it difficult for the translator to render everything. The three translations have shown that if the prime focus is on the content and meaning, the structure and form get disturbed. On the other hand, if the poetic beauty remains the first priority, then the meaning is partly (if not completely) lost. Another important area is the syntagmatic and the paradigmatic relationship which renders a certain pattern to the poem. For instance, the words *bulbul* and *gul* are placed in different lines, but they have dual relationship, including the way they sound and the way they complement the meaning. In other words, by using these words the poet wants to convey his own point of view that he is not the one to listen to the sound of the *bulbul* silently like *gul*. Looking at the translations, it becomes clear that the form changes which also affects the meaning and content. Content in turn is concerned with the subject matter, theme, tone, the overall message and the author's point of view conveyed in the poem. It reverts back to form because what the poem means is strongly linked with how it means. It is perhaps one of the reasons why *Shikwah and JawabeShikwah* was translated three times by different translators. As the analysis has shown, the three

translators have used different strategies both in the choice of words and the way they have been structured to make phrases and clauses. Arbury and Khushwanth Singh have used long lines as compared to Akhtar where the length of lines is short as a result of which the number of lines increases. Moreover, his translation is in quartet form where, unlike Arbury and Khushwanth Singh, rhythm and rhyme are given no serious consideration. On the other hand, the other two translations show a much regular pattern of rhythm and rhyme throughout the stanza. This has much to do with the choice of vocabulary which in turn affects the structure of the lines. Different word choices by the translators to help them in the organization of the lines as they put words of the same sounds at the required places in order to produce rhyming effects. Sometimes, they use transposition and modulation as strategies to make different types of changes in the target texts. These changes, mostly occur in the form rather than the content, which remains somewhat steady. This seems understandable as in selecting between form and content, it is generally believed that sense should have preference over form. Sense is connected with images in the poem and it is there that a poet or author puts the main idea and his mode of intention. In this context some of the three translations have in common is what Popvic calls the invariant core, the emotional tone of the poem and the emphatic style which is apparent from the use of anaphora 'Why' at the beginning of the first three lines in Arbury's translation and alternatively in the first and third line in Khushwanth Singh's translation. Similarly, in Sultan Zahoor Akhtar's translation, the main content remains the same, although the word 'why' is repeated in the initial lines of first two quartets. So, the three translations of the first stanza of the Urdu poem give the sense and logic for initiating a serious discourse which is to come in the following stanzas. This leads to the conclusion that in spite of forms and strategies employed by the translators are different, the invariant which comprises both theme and tone remains almost the same.

References:

- Akhtar, S. Z. (1998). *Shikwa and Jawab-i-Shikwa(representation and reply) English rendering, transliteration with comparative Urdu text*. Lahore: Iqbal Academy Pakistan.
- Arburry, A. J (1987). *Complaint and Answer (Shikwa and Jawab-i-Shikwa) Translated out of Urdu into English Verse*. Lahore: New World Printers.
- Asghar, J. (2014). *An Analytical Study of Kiernen's Translation of Iqbal's Poetry into English(Unpublished PhD Dissertation)*.National University of Modern Languages. Islamabad.
- Ayaz, A. (2009). *Translation as Manipulation: Kiernan's Translation of Allama Iqbal Poetry(Unpublished MPhil Dissertation)*. National University of Modern Languages. Islamabad.
- Bassnet,S. & A. Lefevere (Eds.)(1990). *Translation, history and culture*.London: Routledge.
- Bassnet, S. (2002), *Translation Studies*, London: Routledge.
- Cannoly, D. (2002). Poetry Translation. In B. Mona (Ed.) *Translation Encyclopedia*.London: Routledge.
- Catford, J.C. (1965/2000).*A Linguistic Theory of Translation*.London: Oxford University Press (1965).
- Comrie, B. (1987). *The World Major Languages*. United Kingdom: Taylor and Francis.
- Cuddon,A.J. (1992). *Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms*: England: Penguin Books
- Estella, D. (1993). *Faiz Ahmad Faiz: Urdu Poet of Social Realism*. Lahore: Banquet Printing Press
- Gorp, V. (2001). *Literary Translation*. In Baker, M. (Ed),*Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*.London: Routledge.
- Jakobson, R. (1959).On linguistic aspects of translation. In Reuben A.Brower (Ed.), *On translation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Levinson, S. J. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Deumert, (A). (2011), Introduction: Worldwide linguistic diversity. In Mesthrie, R (Ed.) *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from www.googlebooks.com
- Lefevere, A. (1998). *Translating poetry*. Assen: Van Gorcum. Book.
- Meer, F. (1999). *Fazliaat*. Peshawar: Pashto Academy University of Peshawar.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies, theories and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A textbook of translation*. Shanghai Foreign Language Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *An Approach to Translation*: London: Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). Principles of Correspondence. In Venuti, L. (Ed.), *The translation studies reader*. London: Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J Brill.
- Popvic, A. (1970). *The nature of translation: Essays on the theory and practice of literary translation*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Rachel, A. (2003). The uses of ethnographic methods in English studies. In G. Gabriele (Ed.), *Research Methods for English Studies*. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Raverty, H. G. (1868). *Selections from the Poetry of the Afghans*. Peshawar: De Chapzai.
- Riccardi, A. (2002). Translation and interpretation. In A. Riccardi, (Ed.) *Translation studies: Perspective on emerging discipline*. Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, D. (1868). *Literal Translation*. In Baker, M. (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- Sapir, E. (1958): *Culture, Language and Personality* (Ed. D. G. Mandelbaum). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Singh, K (1981). *Shikwah and Jawab-e-Shikwah Complaint and Answer. Iqbal's dialogue with Allah*. Bombay, Calcutta Madras. Oxford University Press.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (1995). *Translated Studies: An integrated Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steiner, T.R. (1975). *English Translation Theory 1650-1800*. London: Brill.
- Venuti, L. (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*: London: Routledge.
- Hatim, B. & Mason, I. (1997). *The translator as a communicator*. London: Routledge.
- Munday, J. (2001). *Introducing translation studies, theories and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E. J Brill.
- Tariq, R.A. (1973), *Rubayaiat of Iqbal*. Lahore: Sh. Ghulam Ali & Sons.
- Venuti, L. (2003). Strategies of translation. In Baker. M (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*.
- Yang, W. (2010). Brief study on domestication and foreignization in translation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 77-80. Retrieved from [www. Ojs.academypublisher.com](http://www.Ojs.academypublisher.com)

